

# **State of Alaska FY2003 Governor's Operating Budget**

## **Department of Education and Early Development Performance Measures**

# Contents

Governor's Key Department-wide Performance Measures for FY2003.....	3
<b>Executive Administration Budget Request Unit.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Key Performance Measures for FY2003.....	10
<b>Teaching and Learning Support Budget Request Unit.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Key Performance Measures for FY2003.....	13
<b>Early Development Budget Request Unit.....</b>	<b>18</b>
Key Performance Measures for FY2003.....	18
<b>Education Support Services Budget Request Unit.....</b>	<b>21</b>
Key Performance Measures for FY2003.....	21
<b>BRU/Component: Alyeska Central School.....</b>	<b>25</b>
Key Performance Measures for FY2003.....	25
<b>Commissions and Boards Budget Request Unit.....</b>	<b>28</b>
Key Performance Measures for FY2003.....	28
<b>BRU/Component: Alaska Vocational Technical Center Operations.....</b>	<b>30</b>
Key Performance Measures for FY2003.....	30
<b>BRU/Component: Mt. Edgecumbe Boarding School.....</b>	<b>32</b>
Key Performance Measures for FY2003.....	32
<b>Alaska Library and Museums Budget Request Unit.....</b>	<b>36</b>
Key Performance Measures for FY2003.....	36
<b>Alaska Postsecondary Education Commission Budget Request Unit.....</b>	<b>40</b>
Key Performance Measures for FY2003.....	40

**Commissioner: Shirley J. Holloway, Ph.D.****Tel:** (907) 465-2800 **Fax:** (907) 465-4156 **E-mail:** Shirley\_Holloway@eed.state.ak.us**Administrative Services Director: Karen J. Rehfeld****Tel:** (907) 465-8650 **Fax:** (907) 465-3452 **E-mail:** Karen\_Rehfeld@eed.state.ak.us**Governor's Key Department-wide Performance Measures for FY2003****Measure:**

the percentage of students who meet the proficiency level in benchmark assessments in grades 3, 6, and 8;  
Sec 50(b)(1) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Percent Proficient in Reading, Writing and Mathematics on Benchmark Examinations, Spring 2001

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Writing</b>	<b>Mathematics</b>
<b>3rd</b>	<b>71.2</b>	<b>53.5</b>	<b>66.3</b>
<b>6th</b>	<b>69.4</b>	<b>73.0</b>	<b>62.9</b>
<b>8th</b>	<b>82.5</b>	<b>67.9</b>	<b>39.5</b>

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Benchmark examinations were administered for the first time in March of 2000. The State Board of Education and Early Development set the proficiency level for each grade. These proficiency levels are Advanced; Proficient; Below Proficient; and, Not Proficient. Proficiency is defined as the sum of students who scored at the Advanced and Proficient levels on the Benchmark exams. The following chart illustrates the percentage of students who have met the proficiency levels in the two administrations of the benchmarks, Spring 2000 and 2001, the October 1 enrollment, and the participation rate in the assessments.

		Grade 3					
Subject	Test Year	Advanced/Proficient		Below/Not Proficient		October 1 Enrollment	Participation Rate <sup>2</sup>
		Count	Percentage <sup>1</sup>	Count	Percentage <sup>1</sup>		
READING	2000	7,220	72.5%	2,740	27.5%	10,706	93.0%
	2001	7,065	71.2%	2,855	28.8%	10,700	92.7%
WRITING	2000	4,851	48.8%	5,084	51.2%	10,706	92.8%
	2001	5,302	53.5%	4,617	46.5%	10,700	92.7%
MATHEMATICS	2000	6,453	65.0%	3,478	35.0%	10,706	92.8%
	2001	6,550	66.3%	3,326	33.7%	10,700	92.3%

		Grade 6					
Subject	Test Year	Advanced/Proficient		Below/Not Proficient		October 1 Enrollment	Participation Rate <sup>2</sup>
		Count	Percentage <sup>1</sup>	Count	Percentage <sup>1</sup>		
READING	2000	6,958	69.9%	3,001	30.1%	10,574	94.2%
	2001	6,912	69.4%	3,043	30.6%	10,623	93.7%
WRITING	2000	7,180	72.2%	2,760	27.8%	10,574	94.0%
	2001	7,265	73.0%	2,687	27.0%	10,623	93.7%
MATHEMATICS	2000	6,161	62.2%	3,752	37.8%	10,574	93.7%
	2001	6,241	62.9%	3,681	37.1%	10,623	93.4%

		Grade 8					
Subject	Test Year	Advanced/Proficient		Below/Not Proficient		October 1 Enrollment	Participation Rate <sup>2</sup>
		Count	Percentage <sup>1</sup>	Count	Percentage <sup>1</sup>		
READING	2000	7,993	83.2%	1,613	16.8%	10,575	90.8%
	2001	7,824	82.5%	1,660	17.5%	10,377	91.4%
WRITING	2000	6,479	67.5%	3,125	32.5%	10,575	90.8%
	2001	6,420	67.9%	3,040	32.1%	10,377	91.2%
MATHEMATICS	2000	3,724	39.0%	5,815	61.0%	10,575	90.2%
	2001	3,711	39.5%	5,675	60.5%	10,377	90.5%

<sup>1</sup> Percent Proficient and Percent Not Proficient rates only include students that participated in the exams.

<sup>2</sup> Participation rate is calculated by dividing the total count of students tested by the October 1, 2000 enrollment.

### Background and Strategies:

State law requires a comprehensive system of student assessments including a developmental profile for students entering kindergarten or first grade, benchmark assessments in reading, writing, and mathematics at grades 3, 6, and 8, taking the Terra Nova at grades 4, 5, 7, and 9, and passage of the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam in order to receive a high school diploma beginning in 2004. The department has:

1. Provided school districts with state performance standards in reading, writing, and mathematics at the appropriate grade levels.
2. Developed the benchmark examinations in reading, writing, and mathematics for grades 3, 6, and 8.
3. Provided professional development opportunities for standards based instruction.
4. Provided technical assistance to school districts in aligning curriculum to state standards.

The department continues to:

1. Work with school districts to develop programs that provide students with opportunities to learn in order to reach the state standards at the appropriate age/grade levels.
2. Develop intervention strategies to assist students that fail to meet standards or are at risk of failing to meet

standards at the appropriate age/grade levels.

3. Work with school districts to target staff development and teacher in-service opportunities to support standards-based instruction and assessments.
4. Target federal grant dollars to support increased student performance in reading, writing, and mathematics.
5. Administer a norm-referenced assessment, linked to Alaska performance standards, at grades 4, 5, 7, and 9.

**Measure:**

the percentage of students performing above the national average on state-adopted norm-referenced tests;  
Sec 50(b)(2) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The following data shows the percentage of students performing above the national average on the California Achievement Test, Version 5 (CAT/5) for school year 2000-2001

Grade	Reading	Language	Math
4th	58	55	62
7th	58	56	64

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The following chart contains information on the Grade 4 results for the CAT/5 in school years 1998-1999, 1999-2000, and 2000-2001, including the percentage of students scoring in the top and bottom quartile and the percentile ranking for those students scoring above the national average. The same information is included for Grade 7, except for the 1998-1999 school year when the CAT/5 was not required for Grade 7.

**GRADE 4**

School Year	READING			LANGUAGE			MATH		
	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile	Percentile Rank	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile	Percentile Rank	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile	Percentile Rank
1998-1999	31.0	23.0	57	29.2	25.2	52	35.3	22.2	60
1999-2000	31.9	21.9	58	30.7	24.5	53	37.3	20.5	62
2000-2001	33.0	20.8	59	31.1	23.0	55	37.8	18.9	63

**GRADE 7**

School Year	READING			LANGUAGE			MATH		
	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile	Percentile Rank	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile	Percentile Rank	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile	Percentile Rank
1998-1999	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1999-2000	31.9	21.2	58	31.7	22.6	57	38.1	17.5	63
2000-2001	31.2	20.9	59	31.6	21.1	57	40.5	16.3	65

**Background and Strategies:**

The department used the CAT/5 norm-referenced test for the past 5 years. The department has entered into a new contract to administer the TerraNova-CAT/6 test in grades 4, 5, 7, and 9 beginning in the 2001-2002 school year. The addition of norm-referenced tests at grades 5 and 9 will provide a transition to an assessment system with capabilities not now available. Under the new system, students will be assessed each year from grades 3 to 10 using a combination of Benchmark, HSGQE and norm-referenced tests, which will allow for a measure of student academic growth from year-to-year. The ability to track student growth will allow the department to implement in 2002, a school rating system that will assign a designation of distinguished, successful, deficient or in-crisis to each public school in the state as required by AS 14.03.123.

**Measure:**

the percentage of students who took and passed the state high school graduation qualifying exam in the current school year; and  
Sec 50(b)(3) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

## Results of Spring 2001 High School Graduation Qualifying Exam

Reading	65.9%
Writing	46.6%
Mathematics	44.0%

This data will be updated as soon as the results from the October 2001 administration of the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam are available.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The High School Graduation Qualifying Examination (HSGQE) was administered for the first time in March of 2000. The State Board of Education & Early Development set the proficiency level for the exam. The exam is offered in October and March of each school year to provide additional opportunities for high school sophomores, juniors, and seniors to take the exam. The following chart illustrates the HSGQE results comparing the Grade 10 students in the spring of 2000 to the 10<sup>th</sup> Grade Students in the spring of 2001:

**READING**

Test Date	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient <sup>1</sup>	Number Not Proficient	Percent Not Proficient <sup>1</sup>	October 1 Enrollment	Participation Rate <sup>2</sup>
Spring 2000	6,178	74.6%	2,098	25.4%	10,217	81.0%
Spring 2001	5,469	65.9%	2,831	34.1%	10,110	82.1%

**WRITING**

Test Date	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient <sup>1</sup>	Number Not Proficient	Percent Not Proficient <sup>1</sup>	October 1 Enrollment	Participation Rate <sup>2</sup>
Spring 2000	3,924	47.6%	4,319	52.4%	10,217	80.7%
Spring 2001	4,039	46.6%	4,625	53.4%	10,110	85.7%

**MATHEMATICS**

Test Date	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient <sup>1</sup>	Number Not Proficient	Percent Not Proficient <sup>1</sup>	October 1 Enrollment	Participation Rate <sup>2</sup>
Spring 2000	2,717	33.3%	5,454	66.7%	10,217	80.0%
Spring 2001	3,807	44.0%	4,852	56.0%	10,110	85.6%

<sup>1</sup> Percent Proficient and Percent Not Proficient rates only include students that participated in the exams.

<sup>2</sup> Participation rate is calculated by dividing the total count of students tested by the October 1, 2000 enrollment.

**Background and Strategies:**

State law requires a comprehensive system of student assessments including a developmental profile for students entering kindergarten or first grade, Benchmark assessments in reading, writing, and mathematics at grades 3, 6, and 8, and passage of the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam in order to receive a high school diploma beginning in 2004. The department has:

1. Provided school districts with state performance standards in reading, writing, and mathematics.
2. Developed the graduation qualifying examination in reading, writing, and mathematics.
3. Provided professional development opportunities for standards based instruction.

4. Provided technical assistance to school districts in aligning curriculum to state standards.

During the last legislative session, there was significant discussion about what our students are being tested on and how well they are being asked to perform in these areas in order to receive a high school diploma. The legislature was very clear in passing SB 133, Chapter 94, SLA 2001, that the competency exam is to measure the "minimum competency in essential skills" for all high school graduates.

This direction requires that the test be reviewed and refined to determine test items to be used to measure essential skills in reading, writing, and math. This refocusing will require that new test questions be field-tested in the spring of 2002 and that new cut scores be determined in summer of 2002.

**Measure:**

the percentage of students in a high school grade level who pass the state high school graduation qualifying exam on a cumulative basis;

Sec 50(b)(4) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The following chart illustrates the percentage of students in the class of 2002 that have passed the three parts of the HSGQE based on October 2000 enrollment data. These numbers will be updated to include the October 2001 enrollment information and the results from the October 2001 administration of the HSGQE:

	<b>Number Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Proficient</b>	<b>October 2000 Enrollment</b>
Reading	7,495	84.3%	8,887
Writing	5,365	60.4%	8,887
Mathematics	4,495	50.6%	8,887

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The following chart illustrates the results for the class of 2002 for each administration of the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam beginning with the first administration in the spring of 2000. This information will be updated to include the October 2001 results as soon as the data becomes available. Similar cumulative data will be available for each class.

**STATEWIDE HSGQE  
CLASS OF 2002**

HSGQE Student Test Results: Spring 2000, Fall 2001 and  
Spring 2001

**READING**

		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	October 1
--	--	--------	---------	--------	---------	-----------

Alaska's education reform movement is on the right track. We are raising academic standards, seeking new resources and demanding accountability. The high-stakes consequences of the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam will be implemented for students graduating in the spring of 2004 rather than 2002.

During the last legislative session, there was significant discussion about what our students are being tested on and how well they are being asked to perform in these areas in order to receive a high school diploma. The legislature was very clear in passing SB 133, Chapter 94, SLA 2001, that the competency exam is to measure the "minimum competency in essential skills" for all high school graduates.

The commissioner convened a committee of approximately 45 educators to work with the department and the department's test contractor, CTB McGraw-Hill, in refocusing the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam on essential skills. Subcommittees in each of the content areas, reading, writing, and mathematics, reviewed test items that could potentially be used to measure essential skills. This refocusing will require that new test questions be field-tested in the spring of 2002 and that new cut scores be determined in summer of 2002. Additional resources will be needed in the FY2003 budget to accomplish these tasks.

The delay of the high stakes consequences of the HSGQE until the spring of 2004, while continuing to administer the Benchmark exams in grades 3, 6, and 8 as well as the revised and refocused HSGQE, will give us the tools and the time needed to be sure the standards reflect what Alaskans think is important, the test is a good measure and students are adequately prepared. The additional time will assure that all students, including those with learning disabilities and those in highly mobile families who move in and out of our schools, will have had a reasonable opportunity to learn what's tested.

**Measure:**

the percentage change in the number of children served in licensed and in registered child care facilities;  
Sec 51(b)(1) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Children served (capacity) in licensed care from FY00 to FY01 decreased 6% or 996 spaces

Children served (capacity) in registered care from FY00 to FY01 decreased 11% or 700 spaces

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

	<b>FY2000</b>	<b>FY2001</b>
No. of Licensed Facilities	609	580
Capacity/Served	16,505	15,509
No. of Registered Facilities	2,028	1,456
Capacity/Served	6,524	5,824

Effective July 1, 2001, the Department of Education & Early Development took over the statewide responsibility for licensing child care facilities. New child care regulations have been adopted that will improve quality care and move facilities from a category of registered care to licensed care. Registered care is limited to having no more than 4 children in care, including the provider's own children, and is not eligible for the child care grant program.

This combination of factors contributed to the slight decrease in the capacity served from FY2000 to FY2001 as shown in the above chart, i.e.: program transition to different agency and changes in licensing regulations.

Data currently available does not specifically address the measure of number of children served, but rather the capacity, or the number of spaces, for child care available in Alaska. With implementation of new licensing regulations, the number of licensed facilities will increase as the provision for registered care is eliminated. As of January 1, 2002, no new registered facilities will be approved and those facilities will have a transition period to become licensed.

**Background and Strategies:**

Child care licensing provides consumer protection through quality assurance. Minimum licensing standards should be



the floor and not the ceiling. The high percentage of children in licensed facilities indicates that parents, as consumers of child care at all income levels, are seeking quality child care. Incentives are being developed to encourage more providers to pursue licensing.

A high percentage of states have moved to tiered reimbursement rates, paying more for higher quality care. Licensing is usually used to identify the lowest level of quality acceptable for funding, with some states ruling out programs with poor licensing records. There are different ways to distinguish between levels of quality. So far, most states have two levels: licensing and facilities that are both licensed and accredited.

To achieve Alaska's goal of high quality, safe child care, the department is:

1. Revising standards through regulation to reflect the higher expectations of the system.
2. Continuing to provide technical assistance to unlicensed facilities to meet minimum licensing standards.
3. Re-structuring the payment system to provide incentives for achieving and maintaining high quality care.

## Executive Administration Budget Request Unit

**Contact: Karen J. Rehfeld, Director**

**Tel:** (907) 465-8650 **Fax:** (907) 465-3452 **E-mail:** Karen\_Rehfeld@eed.state.ak.us

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

**Measure:**

the percentage of divisions that meet assigned performance measures;  
Sec 49(b)(1) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Of the department's 7 divisions, all report progress in meeting assigned performance measures. Of 45 measures, 88% either meet the assigned measure or are on track.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

This information will continue to be refined as the data collected for each measure becomes more consistent and comparable.

**Background and Strategies:**

The Commissioner has met with every division director to review the measures, progress to date and data to be used in reporting the measure. The three agencies within the department's budget that report to their own board/commission are not included; the Alaska State Council on the Arts, the Professional Teaching Practices Commission, and the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education.

**Measure:**

the change in the percentage of students meeting proficiency levels in uniformly administered benchmark tests in grades 3, 6, and 8 per student expenditure for K-12 support (public school funding) and per the amount reported on the district audited financial statements;  
Sec 49(b)(2) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The following chart illustrates the progress with current data.

**Benchmark Examinations:**

	Spring 2000	Spring 2001	% Change
Grade 3 Reading	72.5	71.2	-1.8%
Grade 3 Writing	48.8	53.5	9.6%
Grade 3 Mathematics	65.0	66.3	2.0%
Grade 6 Reading	69.9	69.4	-0.7%
Grade 6 Writing	72.2	73.0	1.1%
Grade 6 Mathematics	62.2	62.9	1.1%
Grade 8 Reading	83.2	82.5	-0.8%
Grade 8 Writing	67.5	67.9	0.6%
Grade 8 Mathematics	39.0	39.5	1.3%
	<b>FY2000</b>	<b>FY2001</b>	<b>% Change</b>
ADM	131,696.48	132,256.25	0.4%
State Aid - Foundation Program	672,198.2	672,386.0	0.0%
Per Student Expenditure	5.1	5.1	0.0%
Audited Expenditures	992,050.3	*	
* FY2001 Audit Information not yet compiled			

**Measure:**

the change in the percentage of students passing the high school graduation qualifying exam per change in per-student expenditure for K-12 support (public school funding) and per the amount reported on the district audited financial statements; and

Sec 49(b)(3) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Please see chart on the following page.

**High School Graduation Qualifying Examination:**

	<b>Spring 2000</b>	<b>Spring 2001</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Reading	74.6	65.9	-11.7%
Writing	47.6	46.6	-2.1%
Mathematics	33.3	44.0	32.1%
	<b>FY2000</b>	<b>FY2001</b>	<b>% Change</b>
ADM	131,696.48	132,256.25	0.4%
State Aid - Foundation Program	672,198.2	672,386.0	0.0%
Per Student Expenditure	5.1	5.1	0.0%
Audited Expenditures	992,050.3	*	
* FY2001 Audit Information not yet compiled			

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

This is the first year that comparative data is available. The timing of receipt of audited data does not allow it to be included at this time.

**Measure:**

the average time taken to respond to complaints and questions that have been elevated to the commissioner's office. Sec 49(b)(4) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The average time to respond to correspondence tracked in the commissioner's office was 27 days for FY2001.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The correspondence tracking system has not been adequately maintained in prior years to provide a benchmark comparison this reporting cycle. This will be the benchmark for next year's report.

**Background and Strategies:**

Although the correspondence tracking system has been in place for sometime, the department had not implemented an electronic log until this reporting requirement was instituted. Additional effort will be necessary to maintain the log and provide accurate information.

## Teaching and Learning Support Budget Request Unit

**Contact: PJ Ford Slack, Director**

Tel: (907) 465-8689 Fax: (907) 465-6760 E-mail: PJ\_Ford@eed.state.ak.us

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

**Measure:**

the percentage of students who meet the proficiency level in benchmark assessments in grades 3, 6, and 8;  
Sec 50(b)(1) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Percent Proficient in Reading, Writing and Mathematics on Benchmark Examinations, Spring 2001

Grade	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
3rd	71.2	53.5	66.3
6th	69.4	73.0	62.9
8th	82.5	67.9	39.5

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Benchmark examinations were administered for the first time in March of 2000. The State Board of Education and Early Development set the proficiency level for each grade. These proficiency levels are Advanced; Proficient; Below Proficient; and, Not Proficient. Proficiency is defined as the sum of students who scored at the Advanced and Proficient levels on the Benchmark exams. The following chart illustrates the percentage of students who have met the proficiency levels in the two administrations of the benchmarks, Spring 2000 and 2001, the October 1 enrollment, and the participation rate in the assessments.

		Grade 3					
Subject	Test Year	Advanced/Proficient		Below/Not Proficient		October 1 Enrollment	Participation Rate <sup>2</sup>
		Count	Percentage <sup>1</sup>	Count	Percentage <sup>1</sup>		
READING	2000	7,220	72.5%	2,740	27.5%	10,706	93.0%
	2001	7,065	71.2%	2,855	28.8%	10,700	92.7%
WRITING	2000	4,851	48.8%	5,084	51.2%	10,706	92.8%
	2001	5,302	53.5%	4,617	46.5%	10,700	92.7%
MATHEMATICS	2000	6,453	65.0%	3,478	35.0%	10,706	92.8%
	2001	6,550	66.3%	3,326	33.7%	10,700	92.3%

		Grade 6					
Subject	Test Year	Advanced/Proficient		Below/Not Proficient		October 1 Enrollment	Participation Rate <sup>2</sup>
		Count	Percentage <sup>1</sup>	Count	Percentage <sup>1</sup>		
READING	2000	6,958	69.9%	3,001	30.1%	10,574	94.2%
	2001	6,912	69.4%	3,043	30.6%	10,623	93.7%
WRITING	2000	7,180	72.2%	2,760	27.8%	10,574	94.0%
	2001	7,265	73.0%	2,687	27.0%	10,623	93.7%
MATHEMATICS	2000	6,161	62.2%	3,752	37.8%	10,574	93.7%
	2001	6,241	62.9%	3,681	37.1%	10,623	93.4%

		Grade 8					
Subject	Test Year	Advanced/Proficient		Below/Not Proficient		October 1 Enrollment	Participation Rate <sup>2</sup>
		Count	Percentage <sup>1</sup>	Count	Percentage <sup>1</sup>		
READING	2000	7,993	83.2%	1,613	16.8%	10,575	90.8%
	2001	7,824	82.5%	1,660	17.5%	10,377	91.4%

State law requires a comprehensive system of student assessments including a developmental profile for students entering kindergarten or first grade, benchmark assessments in reading, writing, and mathematics at grades 3, 6, and 8, taking the Terra Nova at grades 4, 5, 7, and 9, and passage of the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam in order to receive a high school diploma beginning in 2004. The department has:

1. Provided school districts with state performance standards in reading, writing, and mathematics at the appropriate grade levels.
2. Developed the benchmark examinations in reading, writing, and mathematics for grades 3, 6, and 8.
3. Provided professional development opportunities for standards based instruction.
4. Provided technical assistance to school districts in aligning curriculum to state standards.

The department continues to:

1. Work with school districts to develop programs that provide students with opportunities to learn in order to reach the state standards at the appropriate age/grade levels.
2. Develop intervention strategies to assist students that fail to meet standards or are at risk of failing to meet standards at the appropriate age/grade levels.
3. Work with school districts to target staff development and teacher in-service opportunities to support standards-based instruction and assessments.
4. Target federal grant dollars to support increased student performance in reading, writing, and mathematics.
5. Administer the norm-referenced assessment, linked to Alaska performance standards at grades 4, 5, 7, and 9.

#### Measure:

the percentage of students performing above the national average on state-adopted norm-referenced tests;  
Sec 50(b)(2) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

#### Alaska's Target & Progress:

The following data shows the percentage of students performing above the national average on the California Achievement Test, Version 5 (CAT/5) for school year 2000-2001

Grade	Reading	Language	Math
4th	58	55	62
7th	58	56	64

#### Benchmark Comparisons:

The following chart contains information on the Grade 4 results for the CAT/5 in school years 1998-1999, 1999-2000, and 2000-2001, including the percentage of students scoring in the top and bottom quartile and the percentile ranking for those students scoring above the national average. The same information is included for Grade 7, except for the 1998-1999 school year when the CAT/5 was not required for Grade 7.

##### GRADE 4

School Year	READING			LANGUAGE			MATH		
	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile	Percentile Rank	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile	Percentile Rank	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile	Percentile Rank
1998-1999	31.0	23.0	57	29.2	25.2	52	35.3	22.2	60
1999-2000	31.9	21.9	58	30.7	24.5	53	37.3	20.5	62
2000-2001	33.0	20.8	59	31.1	23.0	55	37.8	18.9	63

##### GRADE 7

School Year	READING			LANGUAGE			MATH		
	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile	Percentile Rank	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile	Percentile Rank	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile	Percentile Rank
1998-1999	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1999-2000	31.9	21.2	58	31.7	22.6	57	38.1	17.5	63
2000-2001	31.2	20.9	59	31.6	21.1	57	40.5	16.3	65

#### Background and Strategies:

The department used the CAT/5 norm-referenced test for the past 5 years. The department has entered into a new contract to administer the TerraNova-CAT/6 test in grades 4, 5, 7, and 9 beginning in the 2001-2002 school year. The addition of norm-referenced tests at grades 5 and 9 will provide a transition to an assessment system with capabilities not now available. Under the new system, students will be assessed each year from grades 3 to 10 using a combination of Benchmark, HSGQE and norm-referenced tests, which will allow for a measure of student academic growth from year-to-year. The ability to track student growth will allow the department to implement in 2002, a school rating system that will assign a designation of distinguished, successful, deficient or in-crisis to each public school in the state as required by AS 14.03.123.

**Measure:**

the percentage of students who took and passed the state high school graduation qualifying exam in the current school year; and

Sec 50(b)(3) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Results of Spring 2001 High School Graduation Qualifying Exam

Reading	65.9%
Writing	46.6%
Mathematics	44.0%

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The High School Graduation Qualifying Examination (HSGQE) was administered for the first time in March of 2000. The State Board of Education & Early Development set the proficiency level for the exam. The exam is offered in October and March of each school year to provide additional opportunities for high school sophomores, juniors, and seniors to take the exam. The following chart illustrates the HSGQE results comparing the Grade 10 students in the spring of 2000 to the 10<sup>th</sup> Grade Students in the spring of 2001:

**READING**

Test Date	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient <sup>1</sup>	Number Not Proficient	Percent Not Proficient <sup>1</sup>	October 1 Enrollment	Participation Rate <sup>2</sup>
Spring 2000	6,178	74.6%	2,098	25.4%	10,217	81.0%
Spring 2001	5,469	65.9%	2,831	34.1%	10,110	82.1%

**WRITING**

Test Date	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient <sup>1</sup>	Number Not Proficient	Percent Not Proficient <sup>1</sup>	October 1 Enrollment	Participation Rate <sup>2</sup>
Spring 2000	3,924	47.6%	4,319	52.4%	10,217	80.7%
Spring 2001	4,039	46.6%	4,625	53.4%	10,110	85.7%

**MATHEMATICS**

Test Date	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient <sup>1</sup>	Number Not Proficient	Percent Not Proficient <sup>1</sup>	October 1 Enrollment	Participation Rate <sup>2</sup>
Spring 2000	2,717	33.3%	5,454	66.7%	10,217	80.0%
Spring 2001	3,807	44.0%	4,852	56.0%	10,110	85.6%

State law requires a comprehensive system of student assessments including a developmental profile for students entering kindergarten or first grade, Benchmark assessments in reading, writing, and mathematics at grades 3, 6, and 8, and passage of the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam in order to receive a high school diploma beginning in 2004. The department has:

1. Provided school districts with state performance standards in reading, writing, and mathematics.
2. Developed the graduation qualifying examination in reading, writing, and mathematics.
3. Provided professional development opportunities for standards based instruction.

Provided technical assistance to school districts in aligning curriculum to state standards.

During the last legislative session, there was significant discussion about what our students are being tested on and how well they are being asked to perform in these areas in order to receive a high school diploma. The legislature was very clear in passing SB 133, Chapter 94, SLA 2001, that the competency exam is to measure the "minimum competency in essential skills" for all high school graduates.

This direction requires that the test be reviewed and refined to determine test items to be used to measure essential skills in reading, writing, and math. This refocusing will require that new test questions be field-tested in the spring of 2002 and that new cut scores be determined in summer of 2002.

#### Measure:

the percentage of students in a high school grade level who pass the state high school graduation qualifying exam on a cumulative basis.

Sec 50(b)(4) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

#### Alaska's Target & Progress:

The following chart illustrates the percentage of students in the class of 2002 that have passed the three parts of the HSGQE based on October 2000 enrollment data. These numbers will be updated to include the October 2001 enrollment information and the results from the October 2001 administration of the HSGQE:

	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	October 2000 Enrollment
Reading	7,495	84.3%	8,887
Writing	5,365	60.4%	8,887
Mathematics	4,495	50.6%	8,887

#### Benchmark Comparisons:

The following chart illustrates the results for the class of 2002 for each administration of the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam beginning with the first administration in the spring of 2000. This information will be updated to include the October 2001 results as soon as the data becomes available. Similar cumulative data will be available for each class.

### STATEWIDE HSGQE CLASS OF 2002

HSGQE Student Test Results: Spring 2000, Fall 2001 and  
Spring 2001

#### READING

Grade	Test Date	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	Number Not Proficient	Percent Not Proficient	October 1 Enrollment
Grade 10	March 2000	6,178	74.6%	2,098	25.4%	10,217
Grade 11	October 2000	994	43.6%	1,286	56.4%	8,887
Grade 11	March 2001	323	24.2%	1,009	75.8%	8,887

7,495

#### WRITING

Grade	Test Date	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	Number Not Proficient	Percent Not Proficient	October 1 Enrollment
Grade 10	March 2000	3,924	47.6%	4,319	52.4%	10,217
Grade 11	October 2000	887	33.6%	1,400	66.4%	8,887
Grade 11	March 2001	283	24.2%	887	75.8%	8,887



Alaska's education reform movement is on the right track. We are raising academic standards, seeking new resources and demanding accountability. The high-stakes consequences of the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam will be implemented for students graduating in the spring of 2004 rather than 2002.

During the last legislative session, there was significant discussion about what our students are being tested on and how well they are being asked to perform in these areas in order to receive a high school diploma. The legislature was very clear in passing SB 133, Chapter 94, SLA 2001, that the competency exam is to measure the "minimum competency in essential skills" for all high school graduates.

The commissioner convened a committee of approximately 45 educators to work with the department and the department's test contractor, CTB McGraw-Hill, in refocusing the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam on essential skills. Subcommittees in each of the content areas, reading, writing, and mathematics, reviewed test items that could potentially be used to measure essential skills. This refocusing will require that new test questions be field-tested in the spring of 2002 and that new cut scores be determined in summer of 2002. Additional resources will be needed in the FY2003 budget to accomplish these tasks.

The delay of the high stakes consequences of the HSGQE until the spring of 2004, while continuing to administer the Benchmark exams in grades 3, 6, and 8 as well as the revised and refocused HSGQE, will give us the tools and the time needed to be sure the standards reflect what Alaskans think is important, the test is a good measure and students are adequately prepared. The additional time will assure that all students, including those with learning disabilities and those in highly mobile families who move in and out of our schools, will have had a reasonable opportunity to learn what's tested.

## Early Development Budget Request Unit

**Contact: Yvonne Chase, Deputy Commissioner**

**Tel:** (907) 269-4610 **Fax:** (907) 269-4635 **E-mail:** Yvonne\_Chase@eed.state.ak.us

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

**Measure:**

the percentage change in the number of children served in licensed and in registered child care facilities;  
Sec 51(b)(1) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Children served (capacity) in licensed care from FY00 to FY01 decreased 6% or 996 spaces

Children served (capacity) in registered care from FY00 to FY01 decreased 11% or 700 spaces

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

	<b>FY2000</b>	<b>FY2001</b>
No. of Licensed Facilities	609	580
Capacity/Served	16,505	15,509
No. of Registered Facilities	2,028	1,456
Capacity/Served	6,524	5,824

Effective July 1, 2001, the Department of Education & Early Development took over the statewide responsibility for licensing child care facilities. New child care regulations have been adopted that will improve quality care and move facilities from a category of registered care to licensed care. Registered care is limited to having no more than 4 children in care, including the provider's own children, and is not eligible for the child care grant program.

This combination of factors contributed to the slight decrease in the capacity served from FY2000 to FY2001 as shown in the above chart, i.e.: program transition to different agency and changes in licensing regulations.

Data currently available does not specifically address the measure of number of children served, but rather the capacity, or the number of spaces, for child care available in Alaska. With implementation of new licensing regulations, the number of licensed facilities will increase as the provision for registered care is eliminated. As of January 1, 2002, no new registered facilities will be approved and those facilities will have a transition period to become licensed.

**Background and Strategies:**

Child care licensing provides consumer protection through quality assurance. Minimum licensing standards should be the floor and not the ceiling. The high percentage of children in licensed facilities indicates that parents, as consumers of child care at all income levels, are seeking quality child care. Incentives are being developed to encourage more providers to pursue licensing.

A high percentage of states have moved to tiered reimbursement rates, paying more for higher quality care. Licensing is usually used to identify the lowest level of quality acceptable for funding, with some states ruling out programs with poor licensing records. There are different ways to distinguish between levels of quality. So far, most states have two levels: licensing and facilities that are both licensed and accredited.

To achieve Alaska's goal of high quality, safe child care, the department is:

4. Revising standards through regulation to reflect the higher expectations of the system.
5. Continuing to provide technical assistance to unlicensed facilities to meet minimum licensing standards.
6. Re-structuring the payment system to provide incentives for achieving and maintaining high quality care.

**Measure:**

the percentage change in the number of eligible children served in a Head Start program;  
Sec 51(b)(2) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

	No. of Children Served FY2000	No. of Children Served FY2001	% Change
Head Start – Ages 3 & 4		2,703	
Early Head Start – Ages 0 to 3		946	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,483</b>	<b>3,649</b>	<b>4.8</b>

There are approximately 14,500 children eligible for Head Start programs due to family income. In FY01, Head Start served 166, or 4.8% more eligible children than were served in FY00.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Head Start grantees utilize a combination of state and local sources to apply for and receive federal Head Start funds which require a 20% match. Additional local match dollars contributed to the 4.8% increase children served from FY2000 to FY2001. Alaska's goal is to increase the number of children served by Head Start by 2% each year for the next 4 years.

**Background and Strategies:**

To increase the number of eligible children served in a Head Start program, the department will:  
Improve data collection on children and families served through Head Start programs to target unserved or underserved communities to expand existing programs or establish new programs;  
Support grantees in meeting the 20% match requirement to access additional federal funds targeted for increases in FFY 2003. State funds are essential in helping grantees meet the match requirement.  
Improve the quality of Head Start programs by providing training to head start workers through the System for Early Education Development (SEED) program.

**Measure:**

the percentage change in the number of staff in child care facilities who received at least 15 hours of training in the current fiscal year;  
Sec 51(b)(3) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Data on this measure is not yet available.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Benchmark Comparisons are not yet available. A data collection system is under development. When completed, this information will serve as a baseline to assess progress in future years. Statewide data will be maintained by EED and individuals will be able to add to their training profiles as they complete additional training and provide appropriate documentation. A status report will be generated annually.

**Background and Strategies:**

The division is utilizing federal funds to implement a comprehensive data collection system. The target date for centralizing training data by individual staff members in facilities across the state is June 30, 2002. Initially this information was to be collected by June 30, 2001 however, delayed implementation of the System for Early Education and Development (SEED) program prevented the division from implementing the data collection effort.

Training and credentialing are both strategies for capacity building and achieving higher quality in child care. Alaska's SEED program is implementing a system of professional development for early childhood education that identifies the types of training and education necessary to achieve competency in the areas essential for early childhood programs.

**Measure:**

the percentage change in the number of children who receive federally funded meals;  
Sec 51(b)(4) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

	<b>FY2000</b>	<b>FY2001</b>	<b>% Change</b>
No. of Children	56,647	59,052	4.2%

In FY2001, 59,052 children, or 45% of the eligible population received federally funded meals. This is an increase of 4.2% over FFY2001.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The Child Nutrition Program distributes federal funds for reimbursement of meals served to eligible children and adults in approved agencies. In comparison to other states, Alaska has a good record on school lunch. In FFY 01, Alaska served 45% of the eligible population, as compared with 42.5% in FFY2000.

**Background and Strategies:**

By including proprietary child care centers in the program, Alaska was able to distribute over \$400,000 in additional federal USDA funds. New centers continue to come into the program on a regular basis.

**Measure:**

the change in the ratio of registered providers compared to licensed providers.  
Sec 51(b)(5) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

	<b>FY2000</b>	<b>FY2001</b>
No. of Registered Providers	2,028	1,456
No. of Licensed Providers	609	580
<b>Ratio</b>	<b>3:1</b>	<b>3:1</b>

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

New regulations have passed with an implementation date of January 1, 2002, that will eliminate the category of registered care. These regulations enhance the health and safety requirements for children in child care facilities and require registered providers who accept public funds to become licensed. The Department of Education & Early Development is expecting approximately 75% of registered facilities to apply for licensing in FY2002.

**Background and Strategies:**

Child care licensing provides consumer protection through quality assurance. Minimum licensing standards should be the floor and not the ceiling. The high percentage of children in licensed facilities indicates that parents, as consumers of child care at all income levels, are seeking quality child care. Incentives are being developed to encourage more providers to pursue licensing and minimum licensing standards should be the floor and not the ceiling.

A high percentage of states have moved to tiered reimbursement rates, paying more for higher quality care. Licensing is usually used to identify the lowest level of quality acceptable for funding, with some states ruling out programs with poor licensing records. There are different ways to distinguish between levels of quality. So far, most states have two levels: licensing and facilities that are both licensed and accredited.

To achieve Alaska's goal of high quality, safe child care, the department is:

1. Revising standards through regulation to reflect the higher expectations of the system.
2. Continuing to provide technical assistance to unlicensed facilities to meet minimum licensing standards.
3. Re-structuring the payment system to provide incentives for achieving and maintaining high quality care.

## Education Support Services Budget Request Unit

**Contact: Karen J. Rehfeld, Director**

**Tel:** (907) 465-8650 **Fax:** (907) 465-3452 **E-mail:** Karen\_Rehfeld@eed.state.ak.us

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

**Measure:**

the number of late penalties for payroll or vendor payments;  
Sec 52(b)(1) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

There were no penalty payments for payroll or vendor payments in FY2001.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Penalty Payments	FY2000	FY2001
Payroll	0	0
Vendor	0	0

**Background and Strategies:**

The Division of Education and Support Services monitors payroll and vendor payments very carefully. Staff is held to performance standards requiring accurate and timely certification of payroll and payment of invoices within a five-day turnaround time.

**Measure:**

the cost of administrative services personnel compared to the total personnel costs for the department;  
Sec 52(b)(2) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

FY2002 Personal Services costs totaled \$27,569,400. Administrative Services personnel costs were \$960,800 or 3.5%.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Personal Services Costs

	FY2001 Authorized	FY2002 Authorized
Department	26,057.5	27,569.4
Administrative Services	990.0	960.8
%	3.8%	3.5%

**Background and Strategies:**

The data used is the FY2002 authorized appropriated amounts for personal services. The department had 373 full time and 114 part time positions approved by the Conference Committee. Administrative Services has 17 full time positions.

**Measure:**

the number of department decisions on the annual school construction and major maintenance lists upheld by the State Board of Education and Early Development compared to the number of appeals;  
Sec 52(b)(3) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

No appeals were filed for the prior year ranking.

The department issues the prioritized school construction and major maintenance lists on November 5, as required by statute. There is a period of reconsideration where school districts may ask the department to review the scoring decisions. A new list is issued on December 15 based on the reconsideration. School districts may choose to appeal the department's decision and a hearing officer is appointed to consider any appeals.

#### Benchmark Comparisons:

	FY01 CIP List	FY02 CIP List
Number of Appeal Hearings	1	0
Upheld by Board	1	0

#### Background and Strategies:

Ongoing efforts to improve the consistency and validity of the rating process have reduced the number of formal CIP appeals. The department annually provides training to school districts in preparing the CIP applications, which has contributed significantly to the quality of the application process.

#### Measure:

the percentage of school districts meeting the minimum expenditure for instruction.  
Sec 52(b)(4) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

#### Alaska's Target & Progress:

In FY2002, 24 of 53 school districts met the 70% minimum expenditure for instruction requirement based on their approved budgets. 29 school districts requested and received a waiver of the requirement from the State Board of Education and Early Development in accordance with AS 14.17.520(d).

#### Benchmark Comparisons:

In 1998 the legislature passed the new public school funding formula. The law includes a requirement for school districts to spend 70% of the school operating fund on instruction. The 70% requirement is in law at AS 14.17.520 and was phased in over a three-year period beginning with FY99. The minimum expenditure for instruction requirement was 60% in FY99, 65% in FY2000, and 70% in FY2001 and thereafter. Concurrently, the districts and department were required to improve statewide comparability and consistency in data reporting.

- The financial information in the FY2002 budgets, including the instructional percentages, will provide a baseline for comparative data in future years now that the implementation period and corresponding changes to data collection have been completed.

The minimum instructional expenditure law has been implemented through the three-year phase in FY99, FY00, and FY01 to the required 70% minimum on instruction. Implementation also included an emphasis on uniform expenditure classifications in order to improve statewide comparability and consistency in data reporting. A revised statewide school district chart of accounts is effective starting FY2002. This chart of account revision reflects three years of working towards increased uniform data in statewide reporting. The emphasis on collection of uniform data also brought about two changes in regulation affecting the instructional component; in FY2001 School Administration was included in instruction and in FY2002 School Administration-Support was broken out and support staff are no longer included in instruction. The 29 waivers in FY2002 are calculated under the fully revised regulations and chart of accounts, and incorporate three years of budget review and increased accuracy in financial reporting.

- Statewide the districts have shown continued improvement towards directing revenues towards instruction. In FY99 only eight districts budgeted 70% on instruction, this year 24 districts have budgeted 70% on instruction.

The increase in the number of waivers represents the implementation period and includes changes to data collection and comparability from one year to the next.

On an individual basis 49 of the 53 school districts have increased the instructional percentage since FY99. Of the four that have not shown an increase two were affected by data reporting requirements and two are small districts with declining enrollments.

#### Background and Strategies:

Districts have reported progress towards the 70% for instruction by reducing non-instructional staff and cutting back on other non-instructional expenditures.

- The department has focused on the administrative categories and with the new detail now provided from the revised chart of accounts the department will also focus on operations and maintenance.

The department's internal auditors review the individual districts twice a year; one budget review and one financial statement review. The reviews encompass a wide range of items and include individual correspondence to each district regarding expenditures.

The following table titled "Minimum Expenditure for Instruction Summary" illustrates the districts meeting this requirement since its inception in FY99.

The table on the following page titled "Minimum Expenditure for Instruction Summary"; illustrates the districts meeting this requirement since its inception in FY99.

## Minimum Expenditure for Instruction Summary

	60% Instructional Percentage FY 1999 Budget	60% Instructional Percentage FY 1999 Financial Statement	65% Instructional Percentage FY 2000 Budget	65% Instructional Percentage FY 2000 Financial Statement	70% Instructional Percentage FY 2001 Budget	70% Instructional Percentage FY 2002 Budget
Alaska Gateway	62%	63%	65%	68%	69%	65%
Aleutian Region	<b>56</b>	62	<b>62</b>	62	<b>65</b>	<b>67</b>
Aleutians East Borough	<b>50</b>	58	<b>64</b>	62	<b>69</b>	<b>67</b>
Anchorage	75	72	74	72	81	78
Annette Island	65	63	65	<b>57</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>61</b>
Bering Strait	61	63	65	65	70	70
Bristol Bay Borough	64	65	65	65	<b>69</b>	<b>69</b>
Chatham	75	70	67	<b>64</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>69</b>
Chugach	67	75	70	76	72	74
Copper River	67	65	66	66	<b>69</b>	<b>69</b>
Cordova City	65	69	66	66	75	70
Craig City	67	70	71	72	73	75
Delta Greely	66	71	72	70	77	73
Denali Borough	64	63	66	67	72	<b>68</b>
Dillingham City	73	67	71	67	78	74
Fairbanks North Star Borough	73	73	72	72	79	77
Galena City	67	72	73	69	82	75
Haines Borough	67	66	67	68	76	73
Hoonah City	61	<b>55</b>	<b>62</b>	59	<b>65</b>	<b>67</b>
Hydaburg City	<b>46</b>	47	65	<b>61</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>64</b>
Iditarod Area	<b>55</b>	59	65	67	75	<b>69</b>
Juneau Borough	74	73	74	74	82	78
Kake City	<b>54</b>	57	<b>63</b>	60	<b>63</b>	<b>62</b>
Kashunamiut	<b>59</b>	58	<b>61</b>	69	74	74
Kenai Peninsula Borough	68	68	68	68	76	73
Ketchikan Gateway Borough	69	69	70	69	78	76
Klawock City	63	61	69	65	74	70
Kodiak Island Borough	68	69	70	70	76	74
Kuspuk	61	62	65	65	73	<b>68</b>
Lake & Peninsula Borough	<b>55</b>	64	72	70	<b>69</b>	<b>67</b>
Lower Kuskokwim	66	64	67	66	75	73
Lower Yukon	60	61	<b>63</b>	62	<b>69</b>	<b>68</b>
Matanuska Susitna Borough	73	74	72	73	81	77
Nenana City	69	69	75	74	75	76
Nome City	61	63	<b>64</b>	64	<b>68</b>	<b>68</b>
North Slope Borough	<b>56</b>	57	<b>64</b>	63	<b>66</b>	<b>65</b>
Northwest Arctic Borough	<b>55</b>	56	<b>59</b>	58	<b>66</b>	<b>65</b>
Pelican City	62	61	69	68	<b>68</b>	<b>58</b>
Petersburg City	69	69	68	69	74	75
Pribilof Islands	<b>57</b>	56	<b>58</b>	61	<b>62</b>	<b>61</b>
Sitka Borough	76	75	76	76	84	81
Skagway City	<b>58</b>	58	<b>62</b>	60	<b>69</b>	<b>66</b>
Southeast Island	66	71	65	68	<b>69</b>	<b>69</b>
Southwest Region	62	65	68	66	74	<b>69</b>
St. Mary's City	65	60	66	65	<b>69</b>	<b>68</b>
Tanana City	61	<b>52</b>	<b>45</b>	46	<b>50</b>	<b>47</b>
Unalaska City	64	64	66	<b>61</b>	72	72
Valdez City	69	68	70	68	77	74
Wrangell City	70	69	70	70	76	74
Yakutat City	65	60	<b>62</b>	62	<b>69</b>	<b>69</b>
Yukon Flats	<b>52</b>	54	<b>52</b>	54	<b>57</b>	<b>61</b>
Yukon/Koyukuk	63	63	<b>63</b>	64	<b>69</b>	<b>68</b>
Yup'it	<b>53</b>	51	<b>62</b>	59	72	<b>63</b>
Total Waivers	13	2	16	4	24	29

**Bold** = Waiver Requested and Approved

## SUMMARY OF PERCENTAGES BY CATEGORY

Districts below 60%	13	13	4	6	2	2
Districts between (60% - 65%)	14	16	12	13	2	6
Districts between (65% - 70%)	18	13	21	22	20	21
Districts at 70% and above	8	11	16	12	29	24
	53	53	53	53	53	53



**BRU/Component: Alyeska Central School**

(There is only one component in this BRU. To reduce duplicate information, we did not print a separate BRU section.)

**Contact: Michael Opp, Director**

**Tel:** (907) 465-6919 **Fax:** (907) 465-2919 **E-mail:** Michael\_Opp@eed.state.ak.us

**Key Performance Measures for FY2003****Measure:**

the percentage of students who meet the proficiency level in benchmark assessments in grades 3, 6, and 8;  
Sec 53(b)(1) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

*Participating ACS students meeting the Proficient and Advanced Percentage Levels.*

	Reading	Writing	Math
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	92%	76%	92%
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade	100%	100%	84%
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade	90%	78%	50%

**Background and Strategies:**

As an alternative home based program, home teachers (usually the parent) are the primary adults working with students. ACS provides home teachers with, rigorous courses and assistance with strategies necessary for teaching at home, especially in math and writing. ACS teachers also create libraries of academic materials for use by home teachers who need additional resources beyond the current standards based curriculum.

**Measure:**

the percentage of students performing above the national average on the state-adopted norm-referenced tests;  
Sec 53(b)(2) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Percentage of ACS students performing above the national average:

	Reading	Writing	Math
4 <sup>th</sup> grade	62%	52%	52%
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	88%	76%	78%

**Background and Strategies:**

Low participation rates in these assessments has limited the schools ability to provide comparable data. ACS is striving to increase participation in all required assessments. ACS works with local school districts whenever possible to accommodate ACS students participation on site. Whenever the local district is unable or unwilling to accommodate ACS students a test center is established.

**Measure:**

the percentage of students enrolled in ACS who take and pass the state high school graduation qualifying exam in the current school year;  
Sec 53(b)(3) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Percentage of participating ACS students passing the individual HSGQE sections - Spring 2001

<b>10<sup>th</sup> Grade</b>	<b>Reading</b> <b>63%</b>	<b>Writing</b> <b>68%</b>	<b>Math</b> <b>36%</b>
------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The following chart compares Spring 2000 to Spring 2001 10th grade students taking and passing the exam.

	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Writing</b>	<b>Math</b>
<b>Spring 2000</b>	65.9%	46.6%	44.0%
<b>Spring 2001</b>	63.0%	68.0%	36.0%

**Background and Strategies:**

ACS is in the process of revising high school math courses to focus on the skills tested on the HSGQE. In addition, two standards based math courses have been developed for students needing remediation.

**Measure:**

the percentage of students in a high school grade level at ACS who pass the state high school graduation qualifying exam on a cumulative basis;

Sec 53(b)(4) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

With transient population by grade level the current cohort tracking system is not adequate to respond to this measure.

**Background and Strategies:**

ACS is in the process of developing the methodology to track each high school grade levels achievements on the HSGQE.

**Measure:**

the percentage of ACS students utilizing post-secondary institutions while participating in ACS programs; and

Sec 53(b)(5) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

4% of ACS students utilized a post secondary institution while participating in the regular ACS program.

**Background and Strategies:**

ACS encourages and funds post secondary course enrollments for students in 10-12<sup>th</sup> grade ACS encourages and funds post secondary course enrollments for students in 10<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade through a process of course selection guidelines and student eligibility requirements.

**Measure:**

the percentage of students enrolled in a state-funded correspondence school program who are enrolled at ACS.

Sec 53(b)(6) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

	<b>FY2000</b>	<b>FY2001</b>
ACS Enrollment (ADM)*	1,419	1,306
Statewide Correspondence ADM	6,407	7,039
	22.1%	18.6%

\*Average Daily Membership

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Released December 15th

FY2003 Governor

12/20/2001 10:38

Department of Education and Early Development

Page 26

Alaska law requires that a student can only be counted as 1.0 Full Time Equivalent. A cooperative agreement must be completed for each student enrolled in an out of district correspondence program. Districts of residence have preference in counting. Very few students are enrolled in two different state wide correspondence programs.

**Background and Strategies:**

For FY2001 the total enrollment of ACS represented 18% of Alaska's home school correspondence students. As a statewide correspondence program, ACS is set up for remote students where parents must rely on ACS to provide all necessary materials and teaching support.

## Commissions and Boards Budget Request Unit

**Contact: Karen J. Rehfeld, Director**

**Tel:** (907) 465-8650 **Fax:** (907) 465-3452 **E-mail:** Karen\_Rehfeld@eed.state.ak.us

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

**Measure:**

the year to year change in ratio of nonstate funds to state funds appropriated to ASCA;  
Sec 54(b)(1) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The ratio of nonstate funds to state funds appropriated to ASCA is 1.5:1. There is no change in the ratio from FY00 to FY01.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

ASCA's budget is reflective of state arts agencies nationwide, with approximately 50% of the funding coming from federal and private sources. The following chart illustrates appropriations of non-state to state funds appropriated to ASCA for the past three years.

	FY00 Authorized	FY01 Authorized	FY02 Authorized
Non-State Funds	\$643.1	\$722.3	\$720.0
State Funds	\$461.1	\$463.8	\$462.7
Ratio:	1.4:1	1.5:1	1.5:1

**Measure:**

the percentage of administration costs compared to grants issued;  
Sec 54(b)(2) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

25% Administrative

75% Grants and Program Service Delivery

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Funding for the ASCA has remained constant over the past 3 years. The administrative to direct service costs has also remained constant.

**Measure:**

the percentage change of artists and of vendors participating in the Silver Hand program.  
Sec 54(b)(3) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

1,500 current Silver Hand artists.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Participation in the Silver Hand program has increased dramatically over the past 3 years. The ASCA is developing a tracking mechanism to be able to provide accurate and comparable data on the number of artists and vendors participating in the Silver Hand program.

**Background and Strategies:**

The Silver Hand program was established by Alaska Statute in 1961 under the Alaska Native Arts and Crafts Sales Act (HB4). Management of the program was transferred from the Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED) to the Alaska State Council on the Arts (ASCA) in FY1999.

Since program transfer to ASCA the number of Silver Hand permit holders has grown from 643 to 1,500 individuals. Currently, ASCA processes approximately 40 memberships per month.

For the Silver Hand program to remain respected among Native Alaskans, which is key to its success, and work as an effective marketing tool for the State, much more outreach and education is needed to target the artists, vendors and public for whom the program is designed to serve. Additional resources are necessary to provide the following services and outreach:

- Site visits by ASCA's staff to meet with and educate artists and shop owners about the program;
- Creation of Native language radio PSAs to publicize the program;
- Creation of rack cards and other recognizable materials for consumers to be placed in all points of entry;
- Enforcement of the program with shop owners and permit holders;
- Statutory expansion of the program to include contemporary Native Artists;

Long term funded Marketing plan to educate Alaskans and "Outsiders" about the program.

**BRU/Component: Alaska Vocational Technical Center Operations**

(There is only one component in this BRU. To reduce duplicate information, we did not print a separate BRU section.)

**Contact: Fred Esposito, Director**

**Tel:** (907) 224-4159 **Fax:** (907) 224-4144 **E-mail:** Fred\_Esposito@eed.state.ak.us

**Key Performance Measures for FY2003****Measure:**

the percentage of graduates employed in their areas of training;  
Sec 55(b)(1) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The Council on Occupation Education (COE) reports the 90% of AVTEC graduates in FY00 are employed in their area of training. Up from 86% in FY99.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

AVTEC's average is directly in line with the benchmark established by COE for the 371 similar participating across the nation accredited by COE. The standard set by COE for public institutions for FY00 is 90%. Up from 86% the prior year. COE establishes an acceptable range for its institutions of one standard deviation of the standard which in this case is 68% or greater.

**Background and Strategies:**

The goal of AVTEC is for all students to find training-related employment. We continue to employ a full-time Job Placement Specialist in that effort. We've expanded our presence in job fairs around the state to network with potential employers. Additionally, AVTEC hosts an annual job fair on campus that has seen increased attendance by state employers.

**Measure:**

the wage increase realized by graduates of training programs;  
Sec 55(b)(2) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

AVTEC graduates increased their median annual wage by 21%. The average quarterly wage for graduates was \$7,206, up from pre-training wage of \$6,428. This statistic is the most current available and is found on page 6 of the "Employment and Earnings of Participating Exiting Alaska Training Programs – FY1999". A special report published by the Alaska Department of Labor, Research and Analysis Section on February 5, 2001.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

While there is no established benchmark for this measure, a comparison to other Alaskan public postsecondary institutions indicates that AVTEC graduates enjoy the highest post-training wage. Alaska Technical Center's graduates post-training quarterly wage was \$6,702. The University of Alaska System graduates earned \$6,423 per quarter after graduation. Based on this report, AVTEC's graduates post-training wage was 8% greater than Alaska Technical Center and 12% greater than the University.

**Measure:**

the percentage of students who completed long-term training programs;  
Sec 55(b)(3) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

COE reports that 80% of AVTEC students completed long-term training programs in FY00. The same as reported the previous year.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Nationwide, completion rate for public institutions accredited by COE is 76%. Up from 67% the prior year. AVTEC is above the national average for similar institutions.

**Background and Strategies:**

While our completion rates continue to improve from the 66% range just a few years ago, AVTEC continues to strive for a 100% completion rate. Increased coordination with sponsoring agencies to pre-screen potential students is helping to avoid sending students with serious substance abuse issues, which remains the primary factor in non-completion. AVTEC has also expanded a foundation skills training program to help prepare students with reading and math deficiencies prior to entering their training program.

**Measure:**

the percentage of students living in student housing compared to student housing capacity; and  
Sec 55(b)(4) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Internal AVTEC Dormitory Census Report for FY01 indicates 55%. Down from 70% the prior year. However, occupancy is averaging 74% for the current year. Family housing comprised of 19 one and two bedroom apartments remain at 100% capacity.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

There is no established benchmark for housing occupancy; AVTEC is striving for a minimum of 75% capacity.

**Background and Strategies:**

AVTEC faces some challenges with respect to its dormitory. The existing dormitory is old and inadequate in comparison to today's student expectations. Gang showers, poor insulation, no sound proofing, lack of telephone and computer connections cause students to look elsewhere for accommodations even if they are more expensive. AVTEC has funding and is in the architectural design stage for a new 64-bed dormitory scheduled for completion in January 2003. AVTEC's plan is to remodel the existing dormitory upon completion of the new dormitory. Both facilities will incorporate the amenities that students expect. Therefore, we anticipate achieving a minimum of 75% occupancy rate with new and remodeled facilities.

**Measure:**

for each long-term program, the percentage of students who applied to the program who actually enrolled in the program.  
Sec 55(b)(5) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

**Current Status:**

Program	FY00			FY01			FY02		
	capacity	applied	enrolled	capacity	applied	enrolled	capacity	applied	enrolled
Industrial Electrical	20	33	22	30	32	30	30	25	25
Information Technology	14	24	14	16	25	16	32	41	32
Diesel Engine	14	17	14	14	13	13	30	15	15
Heavy Equipment	15	19	15	15	9	9			*

\*Diesel and Heavy programs were combined to a single program for FY02

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

There is no established benchmark, except to say it is AVTEC's goal to provide training to all those who seek it.

**Background and Strategies:**

By increasing instructional staff, AVTEC has successfully increased program capacity where needed. Only one program had a waiting list this year compared to four in previous years and that program's capacity was just doubled.

**BRU/Component: Mt. Edgecumbe Boarding School**

(There is only one component in this BRU. To reduce duplicate information, we did not print a separate BRU section.)

**Contact: Hal Spackman, Director**

**Tel:** (907) 966-2201 **Fax:** (907) 966-2442 **E-mail:** Hal\_Spackman@mte.educ.state.ak.us

**Key Performance Measures for FY2003****Measure:**

the percentage of applicants who are admitted to the school;  
Sec 56(b)(1) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Mt. Edgecumbe has more applicants than it has space available. For school year 2001-02, 291 students submitted completed applications, and 150 new students were admitted. Thus, the percentage of applicants who were admitted to Mt. Edgecumbe for school year 2000-01 was 51.5%. The number of beds in the dormitories and classroom space in the academic area limit Mt. Edgecumbe's enrollment. In school year 2001-02, the school was able to boost its dormitory capacity to house 325 residential students and 14 non-residential students for a beginning of the year total of 339 students - its largest enrollment since the school re-opened in 1985.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Since school year 1993-94, an average of 51% of all students who submitted completed applications were admitted to Mt. Edgecumbe High School.

**Background and Strategies:**

The percentage of applicants who were admitted to Mt. Edgecumbe in school year 2001-02, (51.5%), compares favorably with the preceding seven years' average of 51%. Actually, a lower percentage of applicants admitted should be interpreted as a favorable number, for one of Mt. Edgecumbe's goals is reduce student attrition. In other words, because enrollment in the school is limited by residential capacity, if more students continue enrollment in Mt. Edgecumbe from year to year, there will be fewer spaces for new students and, consequently, a lower percentage of applicants admitted to school. As stated earlier in this report, Mt. Edgecumbe is partnering with the AASB, the University system, and other boarding schools through its Resiliency Grant to identify and implement those assets which make students successful and, hopefully, encourages them to stay longer at boarding schools. In addition, Mt. Edgecumbe offers students a full complement of recreational, counseling, and tutorial services in a clean, safe, structured environment.

**Measure:**

the percentage of students enrolled at Mt. Edgecumbe High School who take and pass the state high school qualifying exam in the current school year;  
Sec 56(b).(2) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

Seventy-three (73) Mt. Edgecumbe High School sophomores (Class of 2003) took the HSGQE in Spring 2001. Mt. Edgecumbe High School's sophomores performed as follows on last spring's HSGQE:

.	Reading	Writing	Math	Tested
<b>Spring 2000</b>	66.0%	56.0%	30.0%	84
<b>Spring 2001</b>	49.3%	36.1%	48.6%	73

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The State of Alaska averages of sophomores (Class of 2003) passing the HSGQE Spring 2001 were as follows:

.	Reading	Writing	Math
<b>State Average</b>	65.9%	46.6%	44.0%
<b>MEHS</b>	49.3%	36.1%	48.6%

**Background and Strategies:**



Mt. Edgecumbe High School is doing the following to improve students' HSGQE test scores:

1. Providing an extensive, after-school tutorial program (staffed by five (5) tutors with specialties in different subject areas) - that runs from 6:00-10:00 p.m., Sundays through Thursdays, throughout the school year - for those students in need of academic assistance.
2. Employing a staff reading specialist and Quality School tutor whose focus is to help students build requisite skills and strategies that will enable them to pass the HSGQE
3. Adapting its curriculum to provide intensive, year-long instruction to students in classes that strengthen students' literacy skills - reading, writing, and math.
4. Sending key staff members to summer school at the University of Arizona to obtain reading specialist endorsements, so they can act as on-site staff training resources.
5. Serving as an AK Department of Education & Early Development pilot site and training center for the Carnegie Math program, a nationally recognized, computer-assisted algebra and geometry program, that appears to be having a significant, positive impact on increasing students' math skills.
6. Offering intensive tutorial sessions in preparation for those students who wish to review academic material, to take practice HSGQE questions, and to learn test-taking strategies.

**Measure:**

the percentage of students in a high school grade level at Mt. Edgecumbe who pass the state high school graduation qualifying exam on a cumulative basis;

Sec 56(b)(3) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

- 62 out of 160 (39%) Mt. Edgecumbe H.S. students have passed all three sections of the HSGQE since Spring 2000.
- 93 out of 160 (58%) Mt. Edgecumbe H.S. students have passed two or more sections of the HSGQE since Spring 2000.
- 118 out of 160 (74%) Mt. Edgecumbe H.S. students have passed at least one section of the HSGQE since Spring 2000.
- Comparing Spring 2000 and Fall 2000 HSGQE test scores, students who stayed and Mt. Edgecumbe H.S. and re-took the HSGQE gained an average of:

27 points on the reading portion of the HSGQE;

22 points on the writing portion of the HSGQE; and

26 points on the math portion of HSGQE.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

17 out of 73 (23.3%) Mt. Edgecumbe H.S. 10th grade students taking the AHSQE passed all three sections of the exam on their first attempt in Spring 2001.

19 out of 84 (22.6%) Mt. Edgecumbe H.S. 10th grade students taking the AHSQE passed all three sections of the exam on their first attempt in Spring 2000.

**Background and Strategies:**

In addition to the "Background and Strategies" noted previously, Mt. Edgecumbe:

1. Requires that all students who have not passed all sections of the HSGQE continue to re-take those areas of the test they have not passed in order to gain experience with the test and continue to strive to pass the test.
2. Individually reviews the results of the HSGQE with each student about those areas of the HSGQE that he/she was deficient in, so the student can concentrate on learning those skills and be better prepared for the next exam.
3. Regularly reports HSGQE student test results, and other assessment data, to all teachers and provides on-going professional in-service on how teachers can use this data to improve student performance.

4. Uses a variety of assessment tools to measure student progress.
5. Contracts with a university reading specialist to interpret HSGQE and other assessment results, to provide staff with individual consultation, and to overall help guide school reading strategies.

**Measure:**

the average duration of an individual student's enrollment at the school;  
Sec 56(b)(4) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

- Fifty-five percent (55%) of all students who enrolled in Mt. Edgecumbe High School for school year 2000-01 returned to Mt. Edgecumbe for school year 2001-02.
- Thirty-three percent (33%) of all Mt. Edgecumbe High School students who enrolled as 9th graders, attended all four years at Mt. Edgecumbe High School and received their diplomas in the May 2001.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

- For the seven years preceding school year 2000-01, an average of 50% of all students who enrolled in Mt. Edgecumbe High School, returned to Mt. Edgecumbe the following year.
- In the twelve years preceding school year 2000-01, an average of 39% of those students who enrolled in Mt. Edgecumbe High School as 9th graders stayed all four years and graduated from Mt. Edgecumbe High School.

**Background and Strategies:**

Mt. Edgecumbe High School continues to offer programs that support long-term student attendance and graduation success. Some of these programs are:

1. Activities of the Teen Assets program provide access to three counselors at the U of A Sitka campus, whose duties are to identify a) assets which make students academically and socially successful at a boarding school; b) things which encourage students to stay at a boarding school; and c) processes that build programs which enhance students' assets and success.
2. An after-school tutorial program, staffed by five tutors, keeps the school open to students from 6:00 to 10:00 p.m., Sundays through Thursdays, and provides ongoing academic assistance to students.
3. Complete computer lab, library, and classroom accessibility from 6:00 to 10:00 p.m., Sundays through Thursdays.
4. A variety of recreational programs aimed at promoting students' healthy life choices.
5. Academic and personal counseling support services that utilize school resources and community providers to insure students receive appropriate social services.
6. Varied cultural activities that provide students with a tie to their own and other's cultures.
7. Numerous school-to-work programs, internships, and other educational opportunities provided as a result of school partnerships with businesses (such as IBM, Alyeska Pipeline, and British Petroleum), Native corporations and university partners (UAA, UAS, SJC).

**Measure:**

the percentage of graduates who enroll in a postsecondary education institution or program; and  
Sec 56(b)(5) Ch 90 SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

92% of the Mt. Edgecumbe High School graduating Class of 2001 enrolled in a post-secondary educational institution or program.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

In the preceding five years, an average of 88% of the Mt. Edgecumbe High School graduating class enrolled in a post-secondary educational institution or program. Ninety percent (90%) of the Mt. Edgecumbe student population is Alaska Native.

Nationwide, only 17% of Alaska Native/American Indian high school graduates go on to college.

**Background and Strategies:**

**Mt. Edgecumbe High School:**

1. Partners with the University of Southeast-Sitka Campus and Sheldon Jackson College to offer college courses to Mt. Edgecumbe students that allow them to gain college credit while attending high school.
2. Requires all students to earn 24 pre-requisite credits to obtain a diploma. These required courses emphasize essential academic skills – reading, writing, math - and Pacific Rim languages, technology, and social science.
3. Explores ways to work with the private sector and the university system to provide scholarships, internships, resources, and school-to-work opportunities for students. Mt. Edgecumbe's active partners include IBM, BP, Alyeska, UAA, UAS, and SJC.
4. Offers a challenging, diverse academic curriculum bolstered by a variety of electives (some provided by the University of Alaska Southeast-Sitka Campus and Sheldon Jackson College) that prepares students for the rigors of post-secondary study.
5. Actively promotes an inclusive, technology-rich environment where students are expected to utilize technology during their course of study.
6. Lends strong staff encouragement and counseling assistance to students to help them explore post-secondary opportunities and apply for scholarships that make paying for college a reality. One class, Senior Futures, focuses specifically on teaching skills that prepare students for post-secondary life; assisting students in completing scholarship applications; and providing opportunities for vocational exploration.

**Measure:**

the total state cost per student (set out as instructional costs and residential costs) at Mt. Edgecumbe High School compared to the per student cost for high school students in the school districts in the students' home communities. Sec 56(b)(6) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The average yearly cost to educate a Mt. Edgecumbe High School student in FY2001 was \$13,425. This total cost includes classroom instruction, room, board, travel to and from school, and all other miscellaneous expenses, such as recreation and counseling services.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

In the preceding five years, the average yearly cost to educate a Mt. Edgecumbe High School student was \$13,469 per year. Mt. Edgecumbe has continued its trend to reduce, or maintain, its yearly cost per student since FY94.

	FY1997	FY1998	FY1999	FY2000	FY2001
<b>No. of Students</b>	293	307	302	329	330
<b>Instruct/Resid Costs</b>	\$ 4,024,135	\$ 4,063,500	\$ 4,028,374	\$ 4,284,755	\$ 4,430,200
<b>Average Yearly Cost</b>	\$ 13,734	\$ 13,236	\$ 13,339	\$ 13,024	\$ 13,425

Included in the Instructional/Residential Costs are foundation funding (I/A receipts) and general funds only. A comparison of regional educational attendance areas must be made on an individual basis. The Mt. Edgecumbe High School student population is made up of 330 students coming from over 100 different Alaskan communities.

**Background and Strategies:**

Even though costs to operate schools have risen, Mt. Edgecumbe has been able to reduce the average cost per year required to educate students through essentially two avenues:

- 1) increased student numbers to obtain economy of scale and
- 2) increased privatization by contracting for necessary support services when applicable.

## Alaska Library and Museums Budget Request Unit

**Contact: Karen Crane, Director**

**Tel:** (907) 465-2910 **Fax:** (907) 465-2151 **E-mail:** Karen\_Crane@eed.state.ak.us

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

**Measure:**

the number of public inquiries and the number of governmental inquiries per dollar appropriated for library personnel costs;

Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

32,295 contacts with the public includes reference questions answered, number of patrons served through the Talking Book Library, number of information and assistance contacts with libraries statewide, interlibrary loans provided and the number of library materials circulated.

Personnel cost divided by the number of public contacts equals \$62.83

**Background and Strategies:**

Dividing the total operating budget by number of contacts is not indicative of the cost of service as the operating budget includes the cost of books and library materials, costs for automation, bibliographic services, special collections work and preservation work and supplies. This measure is more reasonably determined by using the number of contacts with the public per dollar appropriated for library personnel. The total cost of personnel services for the Library is \$2,028,935. It should be understood this number also includes costs for those members of the staff who do not interact directly with the public, i.e. administrative support staff, catalogers, etc.

**Measure:**

the number of items catalogued per dollar appropriated for library services;

Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

While the Library's operating budget is \$3,203,900 excluding grants, only 1.85 positions cataloged and processed library materials. Last year, as the State Library cataloged all Alaska State documents, no other library had to catalog these records, saving staff time and expense at the local level. They cataloged and processed 1,228 books and 7,572 government documents for a total of 8,800 items. The Library's personnel cost for cataloging is \$88,323.00. The cost per item cataloged per dollar appropriated for cataloging is \$10.02

**Background and Strategies:**

The staff cataloged 64 % more books and related materials than the previous year. This is a very labor intensive task. On the other hand, the number of federal government documents processed fell 33% ( from 11,539 to 7,572 ) due to the reduction of these items in paper format. Processing federal documents is much less labor intensive than cataloging. This accounts for the increase in cataloging and processing costs over the previous year-cataloging accounted for a greater percentage of the total work load.

**Measure:**

what percentage of Alaskans have access to the Internet;

Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

According to the Denali Commission Report released last year, 61% of Alaskan Communities ( 164 of 267 ) lack access to the internet. These are, of course, smaller remote communities. While we do not have an exact percentage of the population without internet access, the figure is estimated between 12 to 15%.

In the past year the State Library equipped 7 new libraries for internet access and provided training to staff and volunteers.

**Measure:**

the time taken for response to requests made via the Internet and made by voice or in writing and the personnel cost per response; and  
Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The Library deals generally with two types of distance requests, interlibrary loan and reference referrals.

Interlibrary Loan has set a standard of 24 hour turnaround to process requests for other libraries and also for sending out State Library materials in response to specific requests. This standard is met 98% of the time.

Reference Referrals attempts to meet requests within 24 to 48 hours, depending upon the complexity of the request and the research required. In examining response time over a period of months we meet the goal of 48 hour response in 96% of requests.

**Background and Strategies:**

Percentages were derived from a thorough review of requests submitted during FY2001.

**Measure:**

the percentage increase in Internet inquiries made via the library network from the previous year.  
Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

This is a new measure for FY 02 and statistics to address this measure had not yet been developed. The Library installed software at the beginning of FY 02 to capture this information so statistics will be available for the next budget cycle.

**Measure:**

the average time taken from the division's receipt of records and archives to the time that they are made available to the public;  
Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

In the past the staff was able to process incoming archives records at a rate of 4 cubic feet per day, and those archival records were processed within 48 hours. However, staff must now also handle electronic records issues and on-line bibliographical databases. Currently, only one staff member is devoted to archival processing, so paper records are being processed at a rate of 2 cubic feet per day.

**Background and Strategies:**

The Archives changed the level of Archives review from a folder by folder examination to review of the records at the box level.

**Measure:**

the percentage of records retained having long-term value for legal, administrative, or historical reasons;  
Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The Archives does not permanently retain any records with no long term value.

**Background and Strategies:**

The Archives has a target of reducing agency created records by 98%, i.e. only 2% being permanently archived for legal, administrative or historical reasons. The Archives used to retain 5% but has met its 2% target since revising retention schedules several years ago.

**Measure:**

the percentage of current records that are reviewed and those that are destroyed if not considered necessary for long-term legal, administrative, or historical reasons; and  
Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

33% of records retention schedules are reviewed and brought current annually.

**Background and Strategies:**

The Archives instituted a continuous record schedule review several years ago. All schedules are now reviewed on a three year cycle, so at any given time, one third will have been reviewed within the last year. The staff has found that a three year cycle for schedule review is sufficient for identifying changes in administrative records creation.

**Measure:**

the percentage of records available electronically.  
Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

This is a new measure for FY 02 and statistics to address this measure are not yet available.

**Measure:**

the percentage of the collections on public display;  
Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

- A 3% increase of collections on public display compared with FY2000.
- 100% of the collection is available either through existing exhibits or by appointment. At any given time approximately 20% of the collection is on view in exhibits. That 20% is not static as exhibits change and new items are placed on view.

**Measure:**

the ratio of visitors to full-time equivalent employees and full-time volunteers;  
Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

- A 2% decrease in the number of visitors to full-time equivalent employees compared with FY2000.
- A 10.3% increase in the number of visitors to full-time equivalent volunteers compared with FY2000.
- A total of 84,993 visitors to the Museums with 17.5 FTE employees for the Museums, which represents a ratio of 4,857 to 1.
- A total of 117 volunteers provided 5,601 hours of service to the Museums—equal to 2.87 FTE volunteers.
- A total of 52,333 visitors viewed 5 Museum traveling exhibitions at 7 separate venues.
- A total of 1,890 individuals used 631 hands-on educational objects from the Museums at 53 separate schools or institutions.
- A total of 67,155 visitors viewed the Alaska State Museum.
- A total of 17,838 visitors viewed the Sheldon Jackson Museum.

**Measure:**

the percentage change in the number of items added to the collection;  
Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

- A 59% decrease in the number of items added to the collection compared with FY2000.
- A total of 97 objects were added to the Museums'(ASM/SJM) collection (9 objects to the SJM collection and 88 objects to the ASM collection.)

**Measure:**

the percentage of items offered to the museum accepted for museum use;  
Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

- A 7.4% decrease in the number of items offered to the museums as donations that are accepted for museum use compared with FY2000.
- A 17% increase in the number of items offered to the museums as purchase acquisitions that are acquired for museum use compared with FY2000.
- A total of 89 objects were offered to the ASM as donations with 53 of those objects accepted into the collection representing 59% of the total offered to the Museum.
- A total of 7 objects were offered to the SJM as donations with 7 of those objects accepted into the collection representing 100% of the total offered to the Museum.
- A total of 127 objects were offered to the ASM as purchase acquisitions with 35 of those objects accepted into the collection representing 28% of the total offered.
- A total of 2 objects were offered to the SJM as purchase acquisitions with 2 of those objects accepted into the collection.

**Measure:**

the percentage change in state cost per traveling exhibit; and  
Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

- A 39% increase in the cost per traveling exhibit compared with FY2000.
- The Museum developed 2 traveling exhibits at a cost of \$26,509. (In FY2000, it developed one exhibit at a cost of \$9520.)
- The Museum circulated 5 traveling exhibits to 7 separate venues. The only cost is transportation between sites.

**Measure:**

the cost per visitor of traveling exhibits compared with static displays.  
Sec .57, Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

- The cost per visitor for a static exhibit is \$.29.
- The cost per visitor for a traveling exhibit is \$.25.

The Museums developed 1 new static display in FY2001 at a cost of \$19,837.

## Alaska Postsecondary Education Commission Budget Request Unit

**Contact: Diane Barrans, Director**

**Tel:** (907) 465-6757 **Fax:** (907) 465-3293 **E-mail:** Diane\_Barrans@acpe.state.ak.us

### Key Performance Measures for FY2003

**Measure:**

the completion and placement rate of students attending Alaska institutions that offer job-specific training programs;  
Sec 58(b)(1) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

ACPE relies on participating postsecondary institutions to provide the data on which this measurement is based. ACPE is now evaluating data that has been reported to determine the appropriate benchmarking criteria. In order to minimize the cost of reporting and collection of data to both the state and the regulated community, ACPE is working with the Department of Labor, Research and Analysis Division and the Alaska Human Resources Investment Council on this process.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Not yet established.

**Background and Strategies:**

By regulation the Commission now requires institutions under its purview to collect and report completion rates. Once this information is readily available to consumers, it will increase their ability to select a school with high completion or "success" rates.

**Measure:**

the percentage of loans issued by the commission that are in default;  
Sec 58(b)(2) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The 1999 program default rate is 9.65%.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The 1997 program default rate was 14.1%.

**Background and Strategies:**

Continue to expand collections tools and improve revenues:

- Implement consumer awareness campaigns that emphasis education debt management
- Ongoing credit reporting on entire portfolio
- Increase accountability for private sector collection contractors
- Expand occupational license denial
- Expand use of administrative wage garnishment

**Measure:**

the change in the defaulted loan recovery rate; and  
Sec 58(b)(3) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The 2001 annual recovery on defaulted loans is 8.47%.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The 1999 annual recovery on defaulted loans was 10.15%. This is the first year for which recovery data was readily available

**Background and Strategies:**

Strategic efforts related to this measurement are noted under the default rate measurement discussed above.



**Measure:**

the percentage change in administrative cost per loan outstanding.  
Sec 58(b)(4) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

The methodology for estimating loan loss expense was refined in FY2001 and implementation of the AlaskAdvantage FFELP loans is underway. In addition, expanded borrower payment options were implemented.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

Between 06/30/2000 and 06/30/2001 the administrative cost per loan outstanding decreased by 4%.

**Background and Strategies:**

Management continues to pursue options designed to reduce costs, including favorable legislation, increased communication with borrowers and postsecondary institutions, improved collection efforts and modifications to the loan program. Successful implementation of the federally guaranteed loans will help reduce the costs associated with those loans.

**Measure:**

WWAMI - the percentage change in the number of Alaska communities with access to medical services associated with WWAMI/UW;  
Sec 59(b)(1) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

In addition to the 50 communities already served by WWAMI, McGrath and Unalaska received enhanced service from the WWAMI Program in the year 2001.

**Background and Strategies:**

Listed below are some of the services and programs provided in Alaskan communities through WWAMI/University of Washington:

**1. MEDCON**

Within the state of Alaska, virtually every community has increased access or enhanced medical services associated with WWAMI/University of Washington through the MEDCON consulting service. In 2000, almost 4,000 calls were made or roughly 11 calls a day. This service allows physicians from Ketchikan to Barrow to consult with a specialist and get recommendations on patient care.

**2. Alaska Family Practice Residency**

The Alaska Family Practice Residency graduated its second class of eight residents. Ten of the sixteen Family Practice Residency graduates have remained in Alaska to practice medicine in the following communities: Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau and Seward. This year residents will be doing rotations in Bethel (8), Fairbanks (2), Kodiak (2), Wasilla (3), and Soldotna (2).

The residency patient care has increased about 10% over last year. In FY2001, the faculty physicians and residents conducted about 21,000 patient visits. Seventy-five percent of the patient population is medically underserved.

**3. Telemedicine**

WWAMI Telemedicine capabilities were increased, especially in telepsychiatry. We anticipate expanded usage of this format in the future.

**4. Clerkships**

The WWAMI Program offered new clerkships in Advanced Internal Medicine and Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery this year in Fairbanks. Over 10 physicians in Fairbanks received clinical faculty appointments from the University of Washington School of Medicine.

**5. Pediatric Sub-specialty clinics**

Each year, Alaskan children needing care from subspecialist pediatricians are seen in Anchorage by University of Washington School of Medicine faculty that travel to Anchorage. For the year 2001, there will be an increase in the

number of patient visits. In the year 2000, there were 580 patient visits. Last year, 587 patient visits were performed. There is increased need in neurology and urology.

6. UDOC Program

The number of rural or educationally disadvantaged students in the UDOC Program increased from 10 students to 18 students, or an 80% increase.

**Measure:**

WWAMI - the percentage of WWAMI participants who return to the state to practice medicine;  
Sec 59(b)(2) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

In year 2001, 50% of the WWAMI graduates finishing their training returned to Alaska to practice medicine.

**Benchmark Comparisons:**

The average return rate for Alaska is 50.1% (compared to the national average of 40%).

**Measure:**

WWAMI - the percentage change in the number of patient visits provided to Alaskans through programs and physicians associated with the University of Washington School of Medicine WWAMI program;  
Sec 59(b)(3) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

In year 2001, 40% of the returning students chose to practice medicine in a medically underserved area of Alaska. In actual numbers, five students returned and 2 of those are practicing in an underserved area.

**Measure:**

WWAMI - the percentage change in the number of health-related programs developed in the state that are associated with WWAMI/UW; and  
Sec 59(b)(4) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

During the year 2001, there was a 16% increase in health-related programs developed in Alaska by WWAMI/UW.

**Measure:**

WWAMI - the percentage change in the number of research projects in or about the state associated with the University of Washington School of Medicine WWAMI program.  
Sec 59(b)(5) Ch 90, SLA 2001(HB 250)

**Alaska's Target & Progress:**

In FY01, the WWAMI faculty increased their research funding by about 40%, from an average of \$500,000 to a FY01 amount of \$700,000. We anticipate a drop in this amount for FY02 because one of our research faculty relocated to another medical school, and because of research space constraints at UAA.